



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,478	03/23/2001	Donna B. Dulong	CRNI.125945	5342

46169 7590 07/07/2006
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Department
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/815,478	Applicant(s) DULONG ET AL.	
	Examiner Luke Gilligan	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/1/06 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. In the amendment filed 5/1/06, the following has occurred: claims 1, 18, and 35 have been amended. Now, claims 1-51 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 13, 18-20, 23, 30, 35-37, 40, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Engelson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,671,563.

5. As per claim 1, Engelson teaches a computer programmed method for providing one or more medication administration comments for preventing medication administration errors, wherein the one or more medication administration comments are provided at a place of administration of a medication in a hospital setting, the method comprising: accepting a

Art Unit: 3626

medication administrator identification for a medication administrator (see column 13, lines 32-35); accepting a patient identification for a patient from the medication administrator (see column 13, lines 25-28); displaying a graphical user interface listing one or more medications scheduled for administration to the patient (see column 8, lines 57-60); accepting the selection of one of the listed medications, the selected medication corresponding with a medication to be administered to the patient by the medication administrator (see column 13, lines 28-32, since the patient's MAR displays a graphical listing of all scheduled medications, the selection of the particular medication, through the use of a bar code, constitutes a selection of one of the listed medications); determining if a condition for a compliance rule has been satisfied, wherein the compliance rule relates to the selected medication and has one or more associated medication administration comments for preventing medication administration errors (see column 13, lines 49-54); and displaying at the place of administration of the medication in a hospital setting, on a display device, the one or more medication administration comments associated with the compliance rule when the condition has been satisfied (see column 13, lines 54-60).

6. As per claim 2, Engelson teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Engelson further teaches the conditions is satisfied when a generic name for a medication matches the selected medication (see column 13, lines 49-54, since matching the name of the medication is one of the conditions, and both generic and brand name medications are routinely administered in a hospital environment, it is submitted that Engelson teaches this feature).

7. As per claim 3, Engelson teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Engelson further teaches the conditions is satisfied when a brand name for a medication matches the selected medication (see column 13, lines 49-54, since matching the name of the medication is one of the conditions, and both generic and brand name medications are routinely administered in a hospital environment, it is submitted that Engelson teaches this feature).

Art Unit: 3626

8. As per claim 6, Engelson teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Engelson further teaches the comment indicates additional verification of an aspect of the medication should be performed (see column 13, lines 54-65).

9. As per claim 13, Engelson teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Engelson further teaches the comment indicates that the medication should be administered by a certain route (see column 13, lines 49-60).

10. Claims 18-20, 23, and 30 recite substantially similar system limitations to method claims 1-3, 6, and 13 and, as such, are rejected for similar reasons as given above.

11. Claims 35-37, 40, and 47 recite substantially similar apparatus limitations to method claims 1-3, 6, and 13 and, as such, are rejected for similar reasons as given above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4-5, 7-12, 14-17, 21-22, 24-29, 31-34, 38-40, 41-47, and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engelson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,671,563.

14. Claims 4-5, 7-12, and 14-17 recite various additional types of comments that can be displayed on the display device. Although Engelson teaches displaying comments (appropriate information) when a condition for a compliance rule (discrepancy check) has been satisfied, the reference does not explicitly disclose the particular comments recited claims 4-5, 7-12, and 14-17. However these differences are only found in the non-functional data defining the comment displayed on the display device. Data identifying the type of comment displayed is not

Art Unit: 3626

functionally related to the steps recited in the claim. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see Cf. In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Furthermore, in addition to the types of comments that are disclosed by Engelson, as described above, the various types of comments identified in claims 4-5, 7-12, and 14-17 are all old and well known in the art of medication administration.

15. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display any data on the display device as shown in Engelson because such data does not functionally relate to the steps recited in the claim and merely labeling the data differently from that in the prior art would have been obvious matter of design choice. *See In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 555, 188 USPQ 7, 9 (CCPA 1975).

16. Claims 21-22, 24-29, and 31-34 recite substantially similar system limitations to method claims 4-5, 7-12, and 14-17 and, as such, are rejected for similar reasons as given above.

17. Claims 38-39, 41-46, and 48-51 recite substantially similar apparatus limitations to method claims 4-5, 7-12, and 14-17 and, as such, are rejected for similar reasons as given above.

Response to Arguments

18. In the remarks filed 5/1/06, Applicants argue in substance that (1) Akers does not teach certain features of the claims as amended; (2) Brook does not teach certain features of the claims as amended; (3) the combination of Akers, Brooks, and Engelson is improper; (4) Engelson does not teach displaying a list of one or more medications scheduled to be administered to a patient and receiving a selection of one of the listed medications; (5) Engelson does not teach determining if a conditions for a compliance rule has been satisfied; (6)

Art Unit: 3626

Engelson does not teach displaying at the place of administration of the medication the one or medication administration comments.

19. In response to Applicants' arguments (1)-(3) the Examiner is no longer relying on the previous grounds of rejection and as applied a new grounds of rejection in view of Engelson alone. Therefore, these arguments are now moot in view of the new grounds of rejection detailed above.

20. In response to Applicants' argument (4), the Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs Applicants' attention to column 8, lines 57-60 which describes the patient's MAR. The MAR displays both previously administered medications along with future scheduled medications. Therefore, the Examiner does not find this argument to be persuasive.

21. In response to Applicants' argument (5), the Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that the discrepancy checking feature of Engelson is a form of determining if a condition for a compliance rule has been satisfied. Since the discrepancy checking feature of Engelson clearly "relates to the selected medication" and has an "associated medication administration comment" in the form of "appropriate information," it is unclear how it is believed that the compliance rule feature as claimed differs from this element of Engelson.

22. In response to Applicants' argument (6), again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that the displayed "appropriate information" is a form of "medication administration comment" as claimed. It is also clear from the teachings of Engelson that the comment is displayed to the nurse at the location of the patient who is receiving the medication. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Engelson teaches this feature as well.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Hasey teaches displaying medication comments or medications that are to be administered.
- Bartur teaches displaying special instructions for medications that are to be administered.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke Gilligan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6770. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5:30pm.

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6/29/06


C. LUKE GILLIGAN
PATENT EXAMINER